DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 149 814 JC 780 093

AUTHOR Hepp, Charles A.; Brach, Ronald C.
TITLE Student Services Program Planning and Evaluation: Responsibility, Procedures, Instrument, and Guidelines.
INSTITUTION State Univ. of New York, Delhi. Agricultural and Technical Coll.
PUB DATE Jan 78
NOTE 28p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Evaluation Methods; Guides; *Junior Colleges; *Manuals; Measurement Instruments; *Program Evaluation; Student Personnel Programs; *Student Personnel Services; Technical Institutes

ABSTRACT

The manual provides a rationale, procedural guidelines, time-schedules, instruments, and supporting documentation for student services program evaluation at SUNY Agricultural and Technical College, Delhi. Six procedural guidelines include: (1) all programs and services should be evaluated at least once every four years, with provision for annual progress reports; (2) the Office of Student Affairs will establish a schedule for program review; (3) evaluation responsibility remains with the specialized staff in each program; (4) evaluation progress shall be monitored by a program review steering committee; (5) a review of the evaluation shall occur within thirty days of the review panel's visitation of the program; and (6) funding for evaluation will be allocated in each program's budget. The student services program evaluation instrument is presented in outline form, covering program identity, students, personnel, resources and facilities, administration, accomplishments, and summary results and recommendations. A resource manual suggesting sources of data for completing the evaluation instrument and miscellaneous recommendations concerning evaluation report content, format, and style are also included. (LH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED149814

STUDENT SERVICES PROGRAM PLANNING AND EVALUATION:

Responsibility, Procedures, Instrument, and Guidelines

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Charles A. Repp
Ronald C. Brach

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

State University
AGRICULTURAL AND TECHNICAL COLLEGE
Delhi, New York

JC780 093

January 1978

Prepared by:

Charles A. Repp, Vice President for Student Affairs
Ronald C. Brach, Director of Research and Planning

CONTENTS

	Page
INSTITUTIONAL COMMITMENT	1
STUDENT SERVICES RESPONSIBILITY	3
PROCEDURAL GUIDELINES	4
EVALUATION SCHEDULE	7
PROGRAM EVALUATION INSTRUMENT	9
RESOURCE MANUAL	15
MISCELLANEOUS RECOMMENDATIONS ON FINAL REPORT	21

STUDENT SERVICES PROGRAM PLANNING AND EVALUATION:

PROCEDURES AND PROCESS

AN INSTITUTIONAL COMMITMENT TO COMPREHENSIVE PLANNING AND EVALUATION

Established in 1913, the College at Delhi is one of New York State's pioneers in two-year technical and vocational higher education. A unit of the State University of New York since 1948, it presently offers 37 basic fields of concentration. Since 1960 the student body has increased from 350 to 2600 fulltime students. The number of professional staff and programs have grown and a completely new campus built. As a comprehensive college, the educational services at Delhi encompass: career and avocational education and training; education and training for citizenship; research and public service.

Delhi is accredited by the Middle States Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools. However, to continue the commitment to high program quality, it is both desirable and necessary that a continuous, comprehensive planning and evaluation process be pursued. Institutions that will give leadership in the matter of evaluation will find the costs returned to them many times over, partly because evaluation is the way to demonstrable quality and partly because it is the way to true accountability. Money, for particular institutions and also for higher education as a whole, will follow demonstrated quality and accountability. Moreover, a planning and evaluation program carried on year after year establishes its own norms and provides a way of measuring, or at least judging, institutional progress.

Planning and evaluation is conceived as a concerted effort by everyone at Delhi — students, faculty, administration, and other staff — to bring about educational improvement. Institutional integrity flows in part from an

honest and competent effort to evaluate results, whereas a policy of reporting good news and suppressing bad news is the worst kind of accountability. The findings might at times be humbling and sobering; yet Delhi believes that those institutions who can manage and plan on the basis of clear objectives and measured performance will out-distance those who fly blind.

Delhi does not pretend that a comprehensive planning and evaluation process is easy or cheap. The entire concept requires a great deal of invention, learning, operational time, and money. The college has favored starting on a small scale and substantial parts are currently in operation and without exorbitant cost. Yet, the educational impact of a full program could be very great and eventually would justify the investment of no less than 1 to 3 percent of the educational budget on comprehensive planning and evaluation and related research and development.

The key to meaningful planning and evaluation is college and staff commitment and participation. Staff members responsible for student services and activities, for example, will insure the continuing effectiveness of the respective program. Still, individual program planning and evaluation must be a cooperative venture. Staff should have the active cooperation and assistance of all college functions so that required data, information, and other assistance are available. Moreover, the process must be coordinated with institution-wide planning, management, and evaluation programs, including required reporting procedures and timelines. Consideration should be given also to inter-functional relationships, including inter-campus study and ties which extend beyond the campus.

Following are examples of related purposes, users, and products of individual program planning and evaluation:

PURPOSE: Institutional Accreditation and Accountability
Institutional Planning, Management, and Evaluation
Professional Performance and Development
Program Planning, Management, and Evaluation
Performance Auditing and Reporting
Policy Analysis

USERS: Middle States Association
State Education Department
SUNY Central/Other Colleges
Student Affairs
Research and Planning
Academic Affairs

RELATED PRODUCTS:
College Master Plans, Mission Statements, and Budgets
College Self-Study for Middle States
SUNY Master Plan
Program Plans; Missions, and Budgets
Annual Reports - Other Reports on Needs/Results
SUNY/Delhi Cost Analysis Reports
Program Development Proposals

STUDENT SERVICES RESPONSIBILITY

The call for institutional planning, management, and accountability is being heard throughout the land. It reflects in part a failure of confidence in many of our colleges and universities as well as frustration over rapidly increasing costs. One response is to heighten the potential of various educational activities outside the formal classroom in addition to those within for improving outcomes of various types such as student growth and development, new knowledge and art forms, and community impact. Speaking to this question is the whole area of student affairs and services which is an essential aspect of Delhi's educational program. Accordingly, student affairs programs and

services are considered to be an integral part of the college's comprehensive planning and evaluation process. For example, Delhi's 1976 Campus Master Plan recommended that the college place stronger emphasis on improving the quality of residence hall life and on promoting living standards which overall should be highly conducive to a serious and enriching educational experience.

PROCEDURAL GUIDELINES

Following are guidelines and procedures for student services program evaluation:

1) All programs and services will be evaluated at least once every four years with provisions made for an annual progress report. Such efforts shall be coordinated with the college's planning and evaluation, accreditation, and budgetary planning processes.

2) The Office of Student Affairs in consultation with appropriate college units and the Student Affairs Council, will establish a sequence and schedule of program review for each function or unit. A new program or service will not be evaluated until it has been in existence for at least two years. In developing an appropriate schedule, consideration will be given to the mutual benefit which might result from reviewing related programs and services concurrently.

3) Responsibility for evaluating a student services program remains with the specialized staff in that program. Each review will follow the accreditation model procedure which requires a self-

study to be submitted to an external review panel which will visit the campus to review the program in operation and report its findings to the Vice President for Student Affairs. Individual membership of the review panel shall be determined by the Vice President for Student Affairs after consulting with the appropriate program unit. The review panel shall consist of at least five individuals, three of whom shall be from outside the college; that is, from industry or an educational agency. The Director of Research and Planning shall be an ex-officio member of the panel. The Vice President for Student Affairs will develop the charge to the review panel in consultation with the appropriate program unit.

4) A program review steering committee consisting of student services personnel, faculty, students, and the Director of Research and Planning shall assist the program unit and monitor the progress of the evaluation.

5) The review panel will submit its report within 30 days of the campus visitation to the Vice President for Student Affairs who will review the findings with the program unit, the President, and with the task force. An appropriate action plan setting forth priorities and objectives to be achieved within a specified time period by designated offices or personnel shall be devised by program personnel in consultation with the Vice President for Student Affairs.

6) Funding to support the procedure will be provided in the budget allocation of each program unit to cover the travel, honoraria, and related expenses normally associated with the program evaluation.

Under ordinary circumstances, the quadrennial evaluation process should be conducted in four phases during the academic year. Phase 1 initiates the evaluation process for the program unit in September with a joint meeting between the steering committee and program staff for the purpose of reviewing guidelines and the evaluation's design. The second phase ends February 1 when program unit personnel have completed the evaluation instrument and preliminary report. During Phase 2 the steering committee will meet with program unit personnel as required (usually at the mid-point) to verify that appropriate progress is being made and to provide general guidance. The preliminary report will be reviewed with the steering committee between February 1 and March 1. Program staff will complete the final report by April 15. During the third phase the external review panel shall meet on campus for a period of one or two days for the purpose of reviewing the final report, conducting interviews, and consultations. This phase should be completed no later than the end of the spring semester. The fourth phase is one where the Vice President for Student Affairs will review the findings of the review panel in consultation with program unit personnel and the President. It is during this phase also that an appropriate action plan is devised, including provisions for annual progress reports due on or before April 15 of each year.

EVALUATION SCHEDULE FOR STUDENT SERVICES PROGRAMS[1]

1977-78[2]

Health Center

Student Housing and Residence Life

Athletics

Student Life - Student Government, Student Union Student Sponsored Activities

1978-79

Career Planning and Placement Center

Counseling Center

Financial Aids

Educational Opportunity Program

1979-80

Admissions

Student Records

Food Services

Security

---

[1]Begins a four-year cycle for each program unit, with provision for annual progress report.

[2]Initial evaluation begins January 1, 1978 and ends October 31, 1978.

TRANSITIONAL TIMETABLE
FOR 1977-78 STUDENT SERVICES PROGRAM EVALUATIONS

(Health Center, Student Housing and Residence Life, Athletics, and Student Life)

PHASE 1: Orientation of Program Staff to Self-Study
(December 1, 1977 - January 31, 1978)

Joint meetings with Steering Committee and program staff to review Guidelines and evaluation's design.

PHASE 2: Program Staff Complete Self-Study and Report
(February 1 - August 31, 1978)

Completion of Evaluation Instrument and Self-Study Report by program staff. (Mid-point meeting with Steering Committee April 15 to verify that appropriate progress is being made and to provide general guidance. A preliminary report will be reviewed with the Steering Committee between June 15 and June 30. Program staff will complete the Final Report by August 31, 1978.)

PHASE 3: External Review by Panel with Report
(September 1 - September 30, 1978)

On-site visits by external review teams for respective programs. Written reports from external review teams due October 31, 1978.

PHASE 4: Discuss Recommendations, Prepare Implementation Plan
(November 1 - November 30, 1978)

Vice President for Student Affairs will review findings of the review panel in consultation with program unit personnel and the President. Also, an appropriate action plan will be devised, including provisions for annual progress reports due on or before April 15 of each year.

STUDENT SERVICES PROGRAM EVALUATION INSTRUMENT

I. PROGRAM IDENTITY - MISSION, GOALS, OBJECTIVES, AND PRIORITIES

A. Purpose or Responsibility - (Describe in relation to)

1. Societal, student, and community needs

2. College mission and emphasis

3. Interrelationships with other college programs. Include appropriate organization charts.

4. Special concerns of the program that should be reflected in institutional planning and mission statement.

B. Statement of Philosophy - (Describe and explain briefly)

1. The beliefs that govern the development and operation of the program (i.e., the premises which guide the program or activity)

2. Any changes necessary in order to maintain program relevance in terms of conditions such as student characteristics, master plan and college mission emphasis.

C. Objectives - (Identify)

1. As stated in original program justifications, former and current campus master plans, and/or accreditation reports.

2. Other specific objectives which serve to guide program development and evaluation; especially those related to student growth and development including academic progress, research, public service.

D. Activities - (Describe in relation to)

1. Implementation of program objectives

2. The extent to which the activities are designed to reflect the needs of student, campus, and community clientele.

II. STUDENTS

A. Program Workload - (List or explain)

1. Four-year enrollment trends at the college by gender

2. Four-year student workload trends of the program, with notable implications.

3. Proposed workload levels for next four years.

4. Special concerns related to enrollment or workload that should be considered in institutional planning.

B. Entry Level Characteristics - (Describe)

1. Kinds of students enrolled by the college over the past four years; such as their qualifications, origin, goals, needs.

2. Kinds of students served by the program over the past four years (giving special attention to needs).

3. Kinds of special activities designed to meet specific student needs; i.e., tutoring, workshops, orientations.

III. PROGRAM PERSONNEL

A. Job Descriptions - (List or describe)

1. A complete job description for all staff lines.

2. Adequacy of description(s) and any proposed changes.

B. Staff Characteristics - (List or describe)

1. Primary staff involved for each of the past four years enumerating earned degrees, employment experience, length of service at Delhi, age, and appointment status. Also, list any other supportive staff who bring important quality and roundedness to the program. (Include clerical.)

2. Extent to which staff are trained or experienced in the area they are currently serving together with evidence such as professional reputation.

3. Any staff turnover and appointments for each of last four years and resulting consequences for program development.

C. Faculty and College Staff Relations - (Describe or explain)

1. Concerns of the program which require direct faculty and college staff cooperation.

2. Ways in which faculty and college staff are regularly informed about the program's responsibilities and problems and vice-versa.

3. Examples of faculty and college staff cooperative efforts.

4. Special concerns related to faculty and college staff that should be considered in institutional planning.

D. Activities - (Describe)

1. Extent to which program personnel show evidence of professional activity and performance, giving particular attention to the following:

   a) involvement in defining and achieving program objectives and in promoting innovations or improvement;

   b) student service and development;

   c) development of grant proposals, consulting work, committee assignments, college governance activities. Describe accomplishments that can be related to these opportunities.

2. Level and kind of program personnel contributions to other campus functions or programs. Include any teaching assignments.

E. Staff Development - (Describe or explain)

1. How staff development efforts relate to program purpose, philosophy, and objectives.

2. Any special procedures used to improve effectiveness of service. Accomplishments that show how these special techniques actually improved services. Include participation in formal workshops, courses or other related training each year over the past four years.

IV. RESOURCES AND FACILITIES

A. Staff and Services - (Identify or describe)

1. Future staffing needs in relation to current and anticipated enrollments, workloads, and program objectives; include the number and desired qualifications.

2. Adequacy of support from other functions such as academic program, registrar, admissions, counseling, placement, computer services, library, learning resources, maintenance, and student work-study.

B. Supplies and Equipment - (Describe)

1. Levels and kinds of program budget and/or in-kind support for each of the past four years.

2. Adequacy of supplies, travel and equipment levels and any future changes which may be indicated.

C. External Funding or Support - (Describe)

1. Source, amount and purpose of any external funding or in-kind support for each of the past four years.

D. Facilities and Space - (Describe)

1. Specialized facilities and any significant additions made within the past four years. How these are related to the requirements of the program.

2. How the program is assessing the efficiency of its space utilization. Include any improvements resulting.

3. Adequacy of facilities and proposed future facilities plans. (Requirements for institutional planning.)

E. Institutional Support - Describe)

1. Adequacy of overall institutional commitment to providing policy, procedures, organizational structure and resources needed to insure quality and success; consider current responsibilities, and projected college enrollment levels, student characteristics, and planned activities.

2. The development of the program's budget and how staff determine and monitor expenditures to assure optimum returns. (Include special concerns, if any, related to budgeting that should be considered in institutional planning.)

V. PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION

A. Program and Activities Development - (Describe)

1. Procedures for program planning and revision. Indicate roles played by staff and frequency program has been updated and evaluated.

2. The involvement and/or articulation of this program in relation to others for purposes of development. Include: a) student affairs function, b) college, c) region, d) state.

3. The kinds of studies undertaken to determine the continued relevance and quality of the program. Include any recommendations or actions that followed.

4. Program policies currently under study or that need revision which should be considered in institutional planning.

B. Program Performance - (Describe or appraise)

1. Performance in use of resources for each of the last four years using measures such as student/staff ratios; weekly staff contact hours; weekly student contact hours per staff member; staff salary and support costs per staff contact hour, and student contact hour.

2. Attempts to modify and/or improve program performance during the past four years. Include any innovations made in the use of resources.

3. Activities that have been added or discontinued during the past four years and reasons for action taken. Also indicate which, if any, are presently being planned or are endangered.

VI. PROGRAM ACCOMPLISHMENTS

A. Program Impact - (Present or describe)

1. Record of accomplishment or value added for each of past four years. Include qualitative and quantitative evidence of program contributions to the following, where available: a) student growth and development, including academic progress; b) research; c) public or community service.

B. Program Philosophy, Purpose, Objectives - (Appraise)

1. Program effectiveness in attaining stated objectives.

2. Implications for future development, responsibility, or emphasis of present program.

C. Institutional Planning and Development - (Appraise or describe)

1. Program effectiveness in helping attain stated college master plan goals and mission.

2. Implications for future institutional planning and development.

3. When this program should next be evaluated or reviewed for any purpose.

VII. SUMMARY: PROGRAM RESULTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

A. Program Results - (Provide)

1. Summary statement of overall program quality, efficiency and effectiveness based upon findings and conclusions contained in this review.

B. Program Recommendations - (Provide)

1. Recommendations which would lead to further improvement in the college and in program quality, efficiency and effectiveness based on findings and conclusions contained in this review.

2. Any known or anticipated factors which may impede or prevent action on the stated recommendations.

3. Suggested strategy, methods, and timeline for implementation of proposed recommendations.

RESOURCE MANUAL

Responses to the student services program evaluation instrument require a variety of activities including data gathering, consultation, deliberation, analysis, and report writing. Because so much of what is required in the instrument presently exists in one form or another in one office or another and for one purpose or another, the task of student services program evaluation could potentially be quite burdensome for many programs, particularly those with only a few staff to conduct the self-study. To address the obvious need for assistance, the following resources will be available:

a) A steering committee will monitor the progress of the program self-study and, when necessary, will react to the need for clarification or revision;

b) The program head will supervise the activities of the program staff in completing the instrument and will be generally available for assistance. The program head is responsible for the final product and the conduct of a smooth self-assessment.

c) The Office of Student Affairs and the Office of Research and Planning will provide procedural guidance and technical assistance; and

d) A central work location containing various resource documents and materials will be established for use by all program staff.

In addition, this manual has been designed to provide more direct, specific assistance by identifying sources of data or information, that is, an appropriate administrative office or document, and by indicating in many instances the nature of the required responses, that is, staff analysis and/or judgment, table and

appendix. However, resource offices or documents cited here are not meant to be the only ones used in the self-study. Rather they are examples recommended for reference and assistance.

Each student services program staff involved in this evaluation is likely to approach the task in a slightly different way. It is strongly recommended that all student services programs proceed in the following manner:

a) provide a timetable with regularly scheduled meetings;

b) assign tasks with deadlines in order to distribute and accomplish the self-study workload in an equitable manner;

c) complete the instrument sections in the order in which they appear so that the necessary data and information will be available and evident in staff analytical and judgmental responses and for each succeeding step in the evaluation process.

Where staff wish assistance in analyzing data or approaching their tasks, contacts should be made with either Dr. Charles Repp, Vice President for Student Affairs, or Mr. Ron Brach, Director of Research and Planning.

I. PROGRAM IDENTITY - MISSION, GOALS, OBJECTIVES, AND PRIORITIES

A.

1. Consult local, regional, and national reports and studies, e.g., Appalachian, regional and state plans.

2. Examine college's mission statement in campus and SUNY master plans.

3. Program staff analysis. Consult college and function organization charts.

4. Self-explanatory.

B.

1. Program staff analysis

2. Self-explanatory.

C.

1. Consult 1976 and previous Delhi Master Plans and accreditation reports.

2. Include other objectives which may have been established since previous master planning or reaccreditation.

D.

1. Self-explanatory

2. Program staff analysis

II. STUDENTS

A.

1. Contact Office of Research and Planning for data.

2. Based on program staff records and analysis

3. Program staff analysis

4. Program staff analysis

B.

1. Contact Office of Research and Planning for data.

2. Program staff analysis

3. Self-explanatory

III. PROGRAM PERSONNEL

A.

1. Contact Personnel Office and Student Affairs. Include descriptions in appendix.

2. Program staff judgment

B.

1. Program staff analysis. Vitae to be included in appendix

2. Program staff analysis

3. Program staff analysis

C.

1. Self-explanatory

2. Self-explanatory

3. Self-explanatory

4. Program staff analysis

D.

1. Program staff analysis

2. Program staff analysis

E.

1. Program staff analysis

2. Program staff analysis. Include any tabulations in appendix. Also, consult professional performance and growth plans.

IV. RESOURCES AND FACILITIES

A.

1. Program staff analysis. Also, consult Office of Research and Planning for projected enrollment data and anticipated student characteristics.

2. Program staff judgment

B.

1. Student Affairs Office records should show budget expenditures. Also, consult Office of Research and Planning. In-kind support identified by program staff.

2. Program staff judgment

C.

1. Program staff records. Also, consult with College Grants Office and College Foundation Office.

D.

1. Program staff analysis. Also, consult with Office of Research and Planning. Square footage should accompany description.

2. Program staff analysis. Also, consult with Office of Research and Planning

3. Program staff judgment

E.

1. Program staff judgment

2. Program staff analysis. Consult with Office of Student Affairs.

V. PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION

A.

1. Self-explanatory

2. Self-explanatory

3. Program staff analysis. Consult Office of Student Affairs and Office of Research and Planning for other related studies.

4. Program staff analysis. Consult with Office of Student Affairs.

B.

1. Program staff analysis. Consult with Office of Student Affairs and Office of Research and Planning.

2. Program staff analysis. Consult with Office of Student Affairs.

3. Program staff analysis. Consult with Office of Student Affairs.

VI. PROGRAM ACCOMPLISHMENTS

A.

1. Program staff analysis. Consult with Office of Student Affairs and Office of Research and Planning for other related studies.

B.

1. Program staff analysis

2. Program staff analysis

C.

1. Program staff analysis. Consult Delhi Master Plan and Accreditation Reports.

2. Program staff analysis and judgment.

3. Self-explanatory

VII. SUMMARY: PROGRAM RESULTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

A.

1. Program staff analysis and judgment.

B.

1. Self-explanatory. Consult with Office of Student Affairs.

2. Program staff analysis and judgment.

3. Program staff analysis and judgment.

MISCELLANEOUS RECOMMENDATIONS ON CONTENT, FORMAT, AND STYLE OF REPORTS

These recommendations are intended to assist program staff in developing the Student Services program review self-study document. They are based upon the desire to establish consistency within and among student services program review self-study documents. Because of its importance, the self-study document must be readible and understandable for a wide range of people, including those who may not be familiar with a particular program or the college's internal organization and operating procedures. To this end the recommendations which follow are intended to promote consistency for all the college's student services program review self-studies.

1) The document should be a flowing narrative organized according to the instrument outline. Use only the major section headings; that is, I. PROGRAM IDENTITY-MISSION, GOALS, OBJECTIVES, AND PRIORITIES, and the subsection headings; that is, A. Purpose and Responsibility. The items listed numerically under each subsection heading should be treated in the response to that subsection, but they should not be identified separately by headings. In other words, judgment should be exercised in using as much flexibility as is needed in responding to each item.

2) Any appendix material should consist of information requested and other information which is felt necessary to supplement the narrative or complete the document. Typically such information is of secondary importance which the reader can reference. It also is material which, by its nature, would disrupt the continuity of the narrative if placed in the text. The ideal review

document presents the reader with a narrative which describes the program from A to Z without requiring the reader to do research in documents supplied in the appendix.

3) Data are requested at various points in the student services program review instrument. It is sometimes important for the data to be presented in tabular form for immediate reference or for inclusion in the appendix. It is extremely important to remember that all the data should be analyzed as part of the self-study process. In this way program staff will be able to identify significant aspects of the program for the reader. It cannot be assumed that the reader will identify or understand the significance of the data without further guidance. In sum, where data are requested it should be decided what needs to be said in the narrative concerning that data even though the table will appear in the text.

4) When preparing both data and narrative in completing the student services program review instrument, there will be a natural tendency to respond to instrument items with lists. For example, a list of objectives, a list of planned changes in the program. Though this may be helpful in producing the first draft, it does not make a readable document. Various forms of listings can and should be used in response to the instrument items. Over-reliance on lists, however, will make the document very choppy and perhaps unreadable or confusing.

5) The student services program review self-study document is a planning and assessment document. Periodic evaluation of current program objectives, activities, and accomplishments is an essential part of a continuous planning process. Information that is requested is intended to be useful for the program staff and the college's administration in planning the program's future. Avoid "filler" for the sake of creating an impressive document. Quality is more important than quantity.

6) Avoid abbreviations. The reader cannot be expected to know what abbreviations stand for and should not have to search the document to find their meaning.

7) Minimize cross referencing. The student services program review instrument is constructed to develop information in a sequential manner. Cross referencing, though it stresses the inter-relatedness of many aspects of the program, detracts from the document's readability and lessens the importance and impact of the presentation of information.

8) All quoted material and information taken from reports, publications, etc., should be appropriately footnoted. Footnotes should follow acceptable form and style.

9) A Table of Contents should be developed and should correspond with the major section and subsection headings of the Student Services Program Review Instrument. It should also include a list of appendices and a list of tables.

10) Appropriate use should be made of the sample chart formats for reporting staff development information.

11) Accuracy and consistency in the terminology used in referencing college programs should be stressed.

12) Information involving students, faculty, staff, such as minutes from self-study meetings, should omit specific names. The major exception to this is the section on program staff which requires identification of the program personnel and inclusion of their vita.

13) Evidence to support points which will eventually be recommendations toward the conclusion of the final report should be identified and developed at appropriate points in the supporting narrative found in the body of the document. The response to item VII.B.-"Recommendations" should be a brief statement of the recommendation.

14) All drafts and the final document should be double spaced.

15) Format for final draft document: OUTSIDE COVER, TITLE PAGE, TABLE OF CONTENTS, LIST OF TABLES (if tables are used), BODY OF INSTRUMENT, and APPENDICES.

a) Margins - Leave a margin of at least one inch on each of the four sides of the sheet. The left margin is better at 1 1/4 inches to allow for binding. On the first page of every major division of the document, leave 2 inches at the top above the heading.

15. b) Pagination - Assign a number to every page except the blank sheet following the title page (if one is inserted) Number the preliminary pages with small Roman numerals (i, ii, iii, etc.) centered at the bottom of the page on the fifth space above the bottom of the page. The numbers begin with "ii". The title page counts as i, but is not paginated. Number the remaining parts including text, illustrations, appendix, and bibliography with Arabic numerals centered at the bottom of the page on the fifth space above the page.

c) Tables - All tables should be labeled appropriately.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

MAR 17 1978

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGES